REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated May 28, 2004. Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1-13 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 5, 11, and 12 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 8-10, and 13 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 5-7, and 11-12 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waite et al (6,434,600) in view of Hrastar et al (6,529,517). Claims 2, 4, 8, 9, and 13 have been canceled. Their rejections are thus moot. Per the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner on the claims as amended.

Waite discloses a method and system for securely delivering electronic mail to electronic mail servers having dynamic IP addresses. The mail servers register their dynamic IP addresses with a dynamic name server by constructing and sending a packet with the registration data. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Waite fails to expressly disclose the mail server having a separate router to switch data and a server to update the addresses by creating an update message. The Examiner cites Hrastar as teaching this limitation.

However, in contrast to the present invention, Waite in view of Hrastar does not disclose a proxy residing on the DNS, where the proxy changes the update message so that its source address is the address of the proxy, its destination address is the address of the DNS, and its host address is the current address of the dynamically addressed router. This changed update message is then sent to the DNS. The DNS then updates the address of the dynamically addressed router with the host address of the changed update message. In Waite in view of Hrastar, the packet with the registration data in Waite in view of Hrastar is not changed in this manner by a proxy and then sent to the dynamic name server.

Therefore, Waite in view of Hrastar does not teach or suggest the combination of elements as recited in amended independent claims 1, 5, 11, and 12 of the present invention. These claims are thus allowable over these cited references.

Applicant submits that claims 3 and 7 are allowable because they depend on allowable base claims 1 and 5.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waite in view of Hrastar, as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Orsic (6,147,986).

Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable because it depends upon claim 5, which is allowable as argued above.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waite in view of Hrastar, and in further view of Orsic. Claim 10 has been canceled. Its rejection is thus moot.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 5-7, 11, and 12 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and does not appear to be any more relevant than the applied references.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

September 17, 2004

Michele Liu
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,875
(650) 493-4540